IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Michael Lee Rose	
Plaintiff,)
V. First correctional medical Copyrectional medical Services Dr. Hia2, et al,	Civil Action No. 06-370-(JJF)
Defendant. MOTION FOR APPOINT	NOV - 2 2007 U.S. DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
110110111	PO scanned

Plaintiff Michael Lee Rose pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, request this court to appoint counsel to represent petitioner in the above-entitled action for the following reasons:

In deciding whether to appoint counsel for an indigent litigant, the District Court of Delaware articulated standards for evaluating a Motion for Appointment of Counsel filed by a pro se plaintiff. See <u>Green v. FCM</u>, 430 F. Supp.2d 383, 387 n. 3 (D. Del. 2006) (citing <u>Tabron v. Grace</u>, 6 F.3d 147 (3rd Cir. 1993) and <u>Parhan v. Johnson</u>, 126 F.3d 454 (3rd Cir. 1997)). Initially, the Court must examine the merits of a plaintiff's claim to determine whether it has some arguable merit in fact and law. See <u>Parhan</u>, 126 F.3d at 457 (citing <u>Tabron</u>, 6 F.3d 157); accord <u>Maclin v. Freake</u>, 65 F.2d 885, 887 (7th Cir. 1981) (per curium) (cited with approval in <u>Tabron</u> and <u>Parhan</u>). Only if the Court is satisfied that the claim is factually and legally meritorious, should it then examine the following factors: (1) the plaintiff's ability to present his own case; (2) the complexity of the legal issues presented; (3) the extensiveness of the factual

investigation necessary to effectively litigate the case and the plaintiff's ability to pursue such an investigation; (4) the degree to which the case may turn on credibility determination; (5) whether the testimony of expert witness will be necessary; and (6) whether the plaintiff can attain and afford counsel on his own behalf.

In support of this motion, the plaintiff avers the following:

- 1. The plaintiff's does not have the ability to present his own case.
- 2. The plaintiff is unskilled in the law and the complexity of the legal issues presented in the complaint is beyond plaintiff's abilities to pursue an effective investigation.
 - 3. The plaintiff avers that the case may turn on credibility determination.
 - 4. The plaintiff avers that testimony of expert witnesses will be necessary.
 - 5. The plaintiff can not attain and afford counsel on his own behalf.
 - 6. Appointment of counsel would serve "the best interest of justice" in this case.
- 7. The plaintiff's allegations if proved, clearly would establish a constitutional violation because Defendants did act and Knew and Take Pant. In Refusing to give me Medical Help for My Schious Medical problems. That has led To Senious Bodley harm. And Mental, severe Mental emortional distress. This ads up to Deliberate Indifference.

For the foregoing reasons, the plaintiff has provided the court with sufficient foundation for the court to appoint counsel in this case.

Dated: Oct / 31/87

Delaware correctional center 1181 Paddock Road

Smyrna, DE 19977

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Plaintiff,	,)))) (Ci	vil Action	No		_
Defendant.	, et al))))				
	<u>O R</u>	DER				
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, T	THIS	DAY (OF			,
200, THAT THE ATTACHED MC	OTION FO	R APPOINTM	MENT OF	COUN	SEL HAS BE	EEN
READ AND CONSIDERED.	IT IS	ORDERED	THAT	THE	MOTION	IS
HEREBY						
	Un	ited States Dis	strict Cour	t ludge		

Certificate of Service

nd correct cop(ies) of the attached:	upon the following
arties/person (s):	
o: United States Orthol-Court	т о:
44 N. King St. Lock Box 18	
Vilm. Del 19801	
3570	
30:0	
0:	TO:
	·
<u> </u>	
· 	·
· · · ·	
BY PLACING SAME IN A SEALED ENVELOPE	•
States Mail at the Delaware Correctional Cent	ter, Smyrna, DE 19977.
	•
On this 3/ day of Oct	,200 <u>1</u> 7





United States District Cool 1844 N. Ning St. Lock Boy (S William Del: 1980) 185710